

PROPOSED EXTENSION, ALTERATIONS AND REFURBISHMENT
THE WHITE HOUSE
ASKHAM RICHARD
YORK
YO23 3PT

MR AND MRS S WILSON

Ref : 23024_AS_B

ACCOMPANYING STATEMENT

INTRODUCTION

This statement accompanies an application for non-material amendments relating to planning permission no. 22/01467/FUL.

This statement explains further the proposed reasoning / changes.

APPLICATION FOR NON-MATERIAL AMENDMENT

The following numbering relates to drawing no. 23024_PL01 which visually identifies the items on plan and elevation.

1

Proposed change – From zinc sheet roof covering to single ply membrane.

Reasoning – To simplify and improve the drainage of the flat roof. The zinc roof was previously shallow double pitched to prevent it rising above the parapet walls, with a fall in part towards the building. The single ply membrane can be laid flatter than zinc to allow drainage towards the north east elevation of the dayroom, away from the rear wall of the house, thereby avoiding internal drainage and potential issues with water ingress.

Impact – The single ply membrane will be a mid to dark grey (lead) colour and set down from the level of the parapet walls. The membrane will only be visible from the first floor rear windows.

2

Proposed change - From 2 no. large flat roof rooflights to 1 no. lantern rooflight.

Reasoning - To simplify the drainage of the flat roof (alongside item 1).

Impact - The lantern will be dark grey aluminium framed with clear glass. The lantern is set back from and substantially concealed behind the surrounding parapet walls (dayroom and link) and will not be visible from the road.

A lantern rooflight was previously planning approved on an earlier scheme, approval no. 07/02717/FUL. Images of lanterns from neighbouring conservation area of Askham Bryan are included to further illustrate these points (figures A, B, C and D).

3

Proposed change – From Crittall style metal framed doors and side screens facing the rear garden to painted Accoya timber framed doors and side screens.

Reasoning – To improve the thermal performance of the doorsets.

Impact – The appearance of the doorsets will be aligned to the surrounding sliding sash windows, with applied glazing bars to match, producing a coherent elevational design. The doors and side screens will only be visible from the rear garden.

4

Proposed change – Dormer window retained in existing location. The existing dormer would be replaced to match the originally approved design which includes the removal of the hipped end to the dormer roof (not consistent with architectural design found elsewhere in the village). Instead of zinc cladding (noted previously to match the appearance of lead), lead cladding is proposed with double welt flat seams.

Reasoning – The dormer no longer needs to be relocated due to the repositioning of the stair flight internally thereby retaining the roof closer to its existing design.

Impact – There will be less impact on the existing structure in retaining the existing

position for the replacement dormer. Lead cladding is a traditionally used durable material for the cladding of the dormer.

5

Proposed change – Roof windows repositioned to rear roof slope of house to accommodate dormer change (item 4). Minor position changes to roof windows on north west elevation roof slopes.

Reasoning – To allow natural light and ventilation into second floor bedroom to replace that lost by the relocated dormer (item 4). Minor change to other roof window positions to align with interior layout.

Impact – No additional roof windows proposed from that originally approved. Positions are similar to existing.

6

Proposed change – Window glazing bar arrangement changed from 8 over 8 to 3 over 3.

Reasoning – The number of glazing bars in an 8 over 8 arrangement is too dense for the size of the window.

Impact – The window pane proportions match the lower window on the south east elevation and better match the overall size of the window.

7

Proposed change – Dayroom extension to be changed from render finish to facing brickwork.

Reasoning – To use brickwork to legibly distinguish the new extensions from the existing house and previous extension (see also item 8).

Impact – The use of brickwork exists and was originally approved for the dayroom on approval no. 07/02717/FUL. The use of brickwork on the dayroom extension also helps to re-balance the external materials due to item 8.

8

Proposed change – Existing brickwork to 1990's rear extension to be rendered. Existing cementitious render and masonry painted render to existing house will also be replaced. New render to be lime / sand render with mineral paint finish.

Reasoning – Existing brickwork to 1990's extension is very poor quality with very wide mortar joints averaging 30 mm in width. Existing cementitious render and masonry paint finish to traditional solid walls inhibiting the permeable nature of the traditionally constructed walls and needs to be replaced.

Impact – The render finish will improve the appearance of the poorly constructed 1990's brickwork. The lime render and mineral paint finish will revert the traditional walls to a permeable construction and help to resolve internal damp issues.

9

Proposed change – The glazed roof to the link to pitch backwards towards the parapet wall with small single ply covered flat roof / gutter area behind parapet wall.

Reasoning – Pitching the roof backwards will avoid a gutter at the eaves and will allow a minimal glass to glass junction at the facade / glass roof. Collecting rainwater run-off behind the parapet wall will allow discreet evacuation through the wall at the internal wall corner junction with the garage.

Impact – Both the glass roof and single ply membrane covering will be below the level of the parapet wall and will not be visible from the road.

10

Proposed change – Improving the insulation performance of the roof by insulating over the rafters (warm roof), as part of the necessary replacement of the roof coverings. This raises the plane of the roof and ridge level is increased along with eaves and verge parapets to suit. Existing eaves and verge details will be reproduced.

Reasoning – The existing roof covering requires replacement due to roof leaks and recent weather damage. The roof is poorly insulated with insulation below the rafters only. The rafter depth will not allow much more depth of insulation to be introduced and deeper insulation to soffit will unacceptably reduce headroom at second floor level. Insulating over the rafters will allow a much improved insulation value.

Impact – The plane of the roof is raised in level which leads to a raise in level at eaves and ridge. The brick dentil course at the eaves will be re-built at the raised level to match existing. The parapet verges will be raised in level to allow flashing. All affected parts of the walls are proposed to be re-rendered (as item 8) which will homogenise the slight alterations and when complete will look no different to the existing. The roof will be re-covered using clay pantiles to match existing. There will be no change to the height of the chimney stacks.

See roof detail at ridge on drawing no. 23024_PL01 for proposed roof construction and showing minimal roof height increase of 185 mm.

Examples of lantern rooflights in neighbouring conservation area of Askham Bryan:



Fig A - Lantern rooflight partially concealed behind parapet wall and does not dominate overall appearance.



Fig B - Same extension / lantern viewed from farther away, lantern barely visible.



Fig C – Use of lantern rooflight in context with older property.



Fig D – Alternative closer view to fig C.